

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/672,954	09/29/2000	Bimal Poddar	219.38696X00	2928
75	90 10/03/2005	EXAMINER		
SCHWEGMA	N, LUNDBERG, WO	WOODS, ERIC V		
P.O. BOX 2938				
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		2672	

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Response to Rule 312 Communication		09/672,954	PODDAR, BIMAL	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Eric V. Woods	2672	
The MAILING DATE of this com	munication a	appears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence add	ress –
.   The amendment filed on 20 May 2005 und	der 37 CFR 1	.312 has been considered, a	nd has been:	
a) 🛛 entered				
b)   entered as directed to matters of for	m not affectin	g the scope of the invention.		
<ul> <li>c)  disapproved because the amendme</li> <li>Any amendment filed after the da</li> <li>and the required fee to withdraw</li> </ul>	ite the issue f	ee is paid must be accompa		1.313(c)(1)
d) disapproved. See explanation below	w.		•	
		•		
e) entered in part. See explanation be  Specifically, this amendment was merely a  Amendment, and thusly does not change the	clean copy of	f the claims after certain chai ne claims.	nges were made via Examiner's	
	clean copy of	f the claims after certain chai ne claims.	nges were made via Examiner's	
Specifically, this amendment was merely a	clean copy of	f the claims after certain chai ne claims.	nges were made via Examiner's	
Specifically, this amendment was merely a	clean copy of	f the claims after certain chai ne claims.	nges were made via Examiner's	
Specifically, this amendment was merely a	clean copy of	f the claims after certain chai ne claims.	nges were made via Examiner's	
Specifically, this amendment was merely a	clean copy of	f the claims after certain chai ne claims.	nges were made via Examiner's	
Specifically, this amendment was merely a	clean copy of	f the claims after certain chai ne claims.	nges were made via Examiner's	
Specifically, this amendment was merely a	clean copy of	f the claims after certain chai ne claims.	nges were made via Examiner's	
Specifically, this amendment was merely a	clean copy of	f the claims after certain chai ne claims.	nges were made via Examiner's	
Specifically, this amendment was merely a	clean copy of	f the claims after certain chai ne claims.	nges were made via Examiner's	
Specifically, this amendment was merely a	clean copy of	f the claims after certain chai ne claims.	John 9. Brin	
Specifically, this amendment was merely a	clean copy of	f the claims after certain chai ne claims.	JEFFERY BEIER PRIMARY EXAMINER	
Specifically, this amendment was merely a	clean copy of	f the claims after certain chai	John 9. Brin	

·								
	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
Response to Rule 312 Communication	09/672,954	PODDAR, BIMAL						
Acoponico to Auro 0.2 communication	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Eric V. Woods	2672						
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address –						
1. ⊠ The amendment filed on <u>09 August 2005</u> under 37 CFR	1.312 has been considered, and has	been:						
a) 🔲 entered.								
b)  entered as directed to matters of form not affecting	entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.							
c) 🔯 disapproved because the amendment was filed af	disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.							
Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1)								
and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.								
d) disapproved. See explanation below.								
e) entered in part. See explanation below.								
The amendments are dependent claims to already allowed independent claims, and have support in the specification. If the proper petition to withdraw were submitted, they would be entered. However, no petition to this effect has been entered, or accompanied the filing of that document. A statement requesting examiner to withdraw the case from issue is not sufficient. Examiner cannot initiate a withdrawal from issue after payment of the issue fee without a substantial reason for doing so, and the addition of dependent claims does not constitute a substantial reason.								
	• *							
		•						
	•							
	້ປ	Choulan ILKA J. CHAUHAN IIMARY EXAMINER						
·								